

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 14, 15, 17, 19-27, 31, and 33-36 are pending. Claims 5, 6, 21, and 23 are amended.

The Examiner rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards at the invention. Specifically, the Examiner objects to the term “may” in the claim. Applicant has amended the claim to replace “may” with “can,” and Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 5 satisfies the requirements of U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 14, 15, 17, 19-27, 31, and 33-36 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dutton (2006/0200832) in view of Graham (20050038893). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites:

A method for correlating a user’s use of a website with a user’s phone call to a customer service agent for a business, *where the phone call to the customer service agent is made independent of the website*, the method comprising:

for each user that accesses the website, *transmitting a webpage to the user that visibly displays a unique ID, where the unique ID is unique to the user’s web browser, and the where the unique ID is generated without obtaining information that identifies the user personally;*

storing a record of the unique IDs that have been displayed to users in a webpage;
in response to a user telephoning a customer service agent for the business, obtaining the user’s unique ID from the user; and

correlating the user's call to the customer service agent with the users' use of the website using the user's unique ID. (Emphasis added).

The present invention enables a user's use of a website to be correlated with a user's subsequent telephone call to a customer service agent, where the phone call to the customer service agent is made independent of the website (*e.g.*, the phone call is not made by the user clicking on a link in the website). Such correlation is useful in tracking the effect of advertising efforts. For example, if a company pays for a link to its website on a search engine site, such as Google or Yahoo, it is desirable for the company to know the percentage of its customers that used that link to subsequently purchase a product. Such information is relatively easy to track if the customer purchases a product on a company's website after using an advertised link. However, prior to the present invention, such information was lost if, after viewing the website, the customer elected to purchase the product through a different channel, such as the telephone network.

Neither Dutton nor Graham disclose correlating a user's use of a website with a subsequent, independent call to a customer service agent using a unique ID that is visibly displayed to a user in a website.

Dutton discloses a method that enables a user to locate recorded data associated with events [0009]. Specifically, Dutton defines a set of "events" within a communication session with a server. Each event is assigned an event identifier (*e.g.*, a time stamp or a unique ID assigned a webpage), and the recorded data is displayed to the user as a list of events. A user then can select an event for playback/retrieval by selecting the event identifier for the event. In Dutton, the event identifier/unique ID is not used to correlate use of a website with a subsequent phone call to a customer service

agent. Rather, as stated above, it is used to identify and retrieve/playback a portion of recorded data (such as a portion of a recorded conversation, or portions of a browser session). (See paragraph [0010] and claim 1.)

The Examiner cites paragraphs [0023]—[0033] as teaching transmitting a unique ID to the web browser, where the unique ID is unique to the user's web browser. All Dutton teaches here is the well-know concept of transmitting a “cookie” to a web browser and storing a record of the cookie. The Examiner herself admits that Dutton does not disclose transmitting a webpage to a user that visibly displays a unique ID and correlating the user's call to the customer service agent with the users' use of the website using a unique ID.

The Examiner cites Graham as disclosing “transmitting a webpage to a user that visibly displays a unique ID” and “correlating the user's call to a customer service agent with a user's use of a website using a user's unique ID.” However, Applicant respectfully submits that this is not what Graham teaches. Graham discloses a method for (a) using communications between a user and a system to generate a user profile (see third sentence of Abstract, paragraph [0041] and Figure 3); (b) using communications associated with users that have responded to an offer to generate an offer profile for an offer (see second sentence of Abstract, paragraph [0038] and Figure 2); and (c) comparing a user profile with offer profiles to identify the offer that is likely to be the most relevant to the user (see first paragraph of Abstract, paragraph [0042], and Figure 4).

The Examiner cites paragraphs [0030]-[0031] as disclosing “transmitting a webpage to a user that visibly displays a unique ID.” However, in these paragraphs, Graham

discloses that an ad server may associate an “offer ID” with an advertisement. This offer ID is neither unique to a user’s web browser, nor is it displayed to the user.

The Examiner cites paragraphs [0004] and [0009-0010] as teaching “correlating the user’s call to the customer service agent with the user’s use of the website using the user’s unique ID.” However, since Graham does not disclose displaying a unique ID to the user in a webpage, it cannot be interpreted to disclose using such a unique ID to correlate a phone call with use of a website. Furthermore, in Graham, all communications, including voice, appear to be initiated from a website (see paragraph [0041], second sentence). The problem that the present invention overcomes is correlating a phone call to a customer service agent with prior use of a website *when the call to the customer service agent is not made via the website (i.e., the user does not initiate the call by clicking on a link in the website)*.

Dependent claims 2-7, 14, 15, 17, are 33-34 are patentably distinguishable over Dutton and Graham for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 19-22 and 35-36 include the limitations “for each user that accesses the website, transmitting a webpage to the user that visibly displays a unique ID, where the unique ID is unique to the user’s web browser and where the unique ID is generated without obtaining information that identifies the user personally” and “correlating such user’s call to the customer service agent with user use of the website by correlating records from each of the website and customer service agent call center using the unique IDs.” For the reason discussed above, neither Dutton nor Graham discloses these limitations.

Claims 23-27 and 31 include the limitations “a web server for the website that transmits a web page that visibly displays a unique ID to each user that accesses the website, where, for each user, the unique ID is unique to the user’s web browser, and unique ID is generated without obtaining information that identifies the user personally” and “an analyzer that correlates users’ calls to a customer service agent with users’ use of the website by correlating records in the first and second databases associated with matching unique IDs.” For the reasons discussed above, neither Dutton nor Graham discloses these limitations.

Applicants respectfully request allowance of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

MARK D. SCHOENHALS

Dated: June 20, 2008

By: Tina M. Lessani

Tina M. Lessani
Lessani & Lessani LLP
163 Cypress Point Road
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019
Tel: (650) 712-0420
Fax: (650) 712-0449